

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors and to place it in better US form, for instance by inserting headings and the required PCT cross-reference paragraph and by deleting references to the claims. No new matter whatsoever has been added. In addition the Abstract has been shortened and reference numerals and impermissible language have been deleted.

The claims have been rewritten so as better to define the instant invention in view of the art.

The new claims avoid the rejection on US 1,478,424 of Cross. This reference describes a foraminous region (receptacle) 7 through which air is emitted. This surface is not however used to attract and trap insects. In the trap shown in Cross insects are attracted by a light placed at the opposite end of the trap and sucked in by an air stream. The receptacle 7 is necessary only for structural reasons. The air stream emitted by the porous mesh (7) does not improve the efficiency of the insect trap. In addition

this reference does not show the means for trapping insects on the air-emitting surface. Therefore new claim 56 is novel over Cross.

US 6,145,243 of Wigton describes an insect trap where several attractants (CO₂, water vapour and heat) are generated and aspirated downward by an exhaust tube. A counterflow of outside air is drawn into the trap through a suction tube that concentrically surrounds the exhaust tube. There are three differences between the instant invention and this system:

1. A different attractant is used: Wigton uses CO₂, water vapour and heat whereas the present invention uses flowing air as attractant.

2. The means for trapping the insects (suction tube) is not on the emanating surface but surrounds the exhaust tube.

3. The reference shows an injector through which the attractants are released instead of a two-dimensional surface of a certain size.

Thus new claim 56 is also novel over Wigton.

Because claim 56 is novel over the state of the art, the depending claims 57 to 77 are also novel.

The novelty behind the invention is the use of a weak air stream as attractant for insects. It is also inventive because the known state of the art always shows the use of some sort of

attractant to attract and trap insects. In Cross and US 4,282,673 of Focks insects are drawn to the light, in US 4,141,173 of Weimert a combination of light and warmth is used, in Wigton insects are attracted by CO₂, water vapour and heat.

An expert of this field would not have drawn the conclusion to use an flowing weak air stream to attract insects. Furthermore, in view of Cross an expert would not draw the conclusion to place trapping means within an air-emitting surface because in Cross the mesh bag 7 is only used for collecting of the trapped insects and not at all for attracting them.

In Wigton the attractants are sucked downward. If an expert reads about an air-emitting surface, it is clear for him that the flow goes to in any direction but downward. Therefore Wigton does not suggest the invention to an expert in the field of insect traps.

The rejections under §102 and §103 are therefore overcome.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this

case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

K.F. Ross P.C.

//Andrew Wilford//

by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

11 March 2008
5683 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: 718 884-6600
Fax: 718 601-1099
Email: email@kfrpc.com

Enclosure: Corrected version
 Substitute Specification
 Substitute Abstract